

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

**TAFIKO SALU,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**MULTNOMAH COUNTY,**

Defendant.

Case No. 3:21-cv-01387-AR

**ORDER ADOPTING F&R**

Justin R. Steffen, Steffen Legal Services, LLC, 2100 SE Lake Rd., #5, Milwaukie, OR 97222.  
Attorney for Plaintiff.

Ashley Bannon Moore & Christopher A. Gilmore, Multnomah County Attorney's Office, 501  
SE Hawthorne Blvd, Suite 500, Portland, OR 97214. Attorneys for Defendant.

**IMMERGUT, District Judge.**

On January 17, 2025, Magistrate Judge Armistead issued his Findings and  
Recommendation ("F&R"), ECF 68. The F&R recommends that this Court grant Defendant's  
Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF 47. No party filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act ("Act"), as amended, the court may "accept, reject, or  
modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge."

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). If a party objects to a magistrate judge's F&R, "the court shall make a

de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.* But the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the F&R that are not objected to. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). Nevertheless, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge, *sua sponte*” whether de novo or under another standard. *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154.

No party having filed objections, this Court has reviewed the F&R and accepts Judge Armistead’s conclusions. The F&R, ECF 68, is adopted in full. This Court GRANTS Defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF 47, and DISMISSES this case with prejudice.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

DATED this 10th day of February, 2025.

/s/ Karin J. Immergut  
Karin J. Immergut  
United States District Judge